DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 615 EA 018 084

AUTHOR Sorenson, Larry Dean
TITLE Decision Making of Public School Superintendents: The Involvement of Subordinates and Others.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Styles; Management Teams; *Participative Decision Making; Predictor Variables; Public Schools; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS Idaho; Oregon; Situational Administrative Decision Making Invent; Washington

ABSTRACT

Public school superintendents consider situational and organizational variables when determining whether to involve others in decision-making processes. A sample of 240 superintendents from Washington, Oregon, and Idaho were sent the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory. The sample was evenly divided geographically and by district size. The 184 respondents were presented with representative situations drawn from six topic categories: business, instruction, personnel relations, student relations, community relations, and noninstructional operations. Each situation included a short, medium, or long decision-making time frame. Respondents were asked to characterize each situation according to the extent to which they would make their decisions alone or with some degree of participation by others. The results were examined using analysis of variance. The data revealed that participatory modes were used more when time frames were longer and when districts were larger. Mean scores for the different situations suggested that only in rare cases do superintendents feel called upon to include others in decision-making formally, and even more rarely do they act with only minimal advice. The great majority of decisions, under all types of time constraints, tend to be made after a significant amount of input has been sought through informal means. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265615

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry Dean Sorenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DECISION MAKING OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS: THE INVOLVEMENT OF SUBORDINATES AND OTHERS

Larry Dean Sorenson

Clarkston Public Schools

Clarkston, Washington

PAPER PRESENTED TO THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
ANNUAL MEETING CHICAGO, APRIL 1985

EA 018 084

This study had two goals; (a) to identify situational and organizational variables which influence the involvement of subordinate administrators and others in decision making and (b) to describe the decision-making processes used by superintendents.

Background

Team management, that is the participation of subordinate administrators and others in decision making in public school administration, is a poorly defined management method (Schmuck, 1974; Boles, 1975). Erickson and Rose (1973) defined team management as "...the structure resulting when two or more people are engaged, together, in tasks of management"(p.1). Cullens (1973) assured readers that the traditional hierarchy of authority is not dissolved by the implementation of team management. Presumably, superintendents who consider themselves team managers may still opt to utilize more autocratic decision-making methods. Subordinate administrators and others may be involved in decision making or may not be consulted. The subordinate school administrators role in decision making is unclear.

During the 20th century the traditional, hierarchical paradigm of management in industry began to moderate. Power enjoyed by managers began to erode as workers unionized and began to demand improved working conditions and a part in decision making. Weberian notions of omnipotent manager-power and its expectant employee conformity were moderated. Viable employee participation in planning and decision making, slow to develop,

was urged by leadership innovators. Recently, terms such as subordinate, superordinate, boss, and worker have been supplanted with words such as team leader, team member, and constituent.

Parallels in management methodologies between business and schools administration have been reported (Callahan, 1962; Abbott, 1969; Broido, 1980). Modifications of traditional management theory made in industry filtered into educational leadership practices.

Superintendents and school boards gave way to strong teacher-negotiated agreements (union contracts). Teacher unions excluded middle management (principals) from their bargaining units and dramatically changed the building administrator's status. As teacher militancy and power increased, boards of education and superintendents relinquished some of the previously unquestioned administrative prerogatives as part of contract negotiations (Hanson, 1979; McDonnell & Pascal, 1979); this led to subordinate administrator dissatisfaction (Cunningham, 1978). As subordinate administrators began to turn to local, state, and national administrator organizations for protection and representation, superintendents and school boards recognized the possibility of having to negotiate with yet another special interest group. School boards were acutely aware that principals, in need of representation, were potential adversaries. This concern is exemplified by an article entitled "It's late, but there's still time to give your principal a real say in management" (The American School Board Journal, 1976, p.32). The article advanced the notion that principal groups could become bargaining adversaries and described the need for the unification of all school

administrators against teacher unions and their demands. The article stated, "...averting an outright revolt of principals will entail some quick and decisive action by school boards and superintendents" (p.32).

The National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators have endorsed the "Management Team" concept (AASA/NSBA, 1979) which is fundamentally concerned with the inclusion of all school administrators in school management and the unification of administrators in the collective bargaining process. Potter (1982) has stated, "Another need of school boards is to find a way to avoid collective bargaining with their principals who are rapidly becoming more a part of management than of the instructional team which includes teachers" (p.25).

Participation by subordinate administrators in decision making may provide some benefit to employee satisfaction (Schmuck, 1974; Spady, Bell & D'Angelo, 1979); it also represents important political advantages for school superintendents and school boards by neutralizing one potentially adversarial group. These political advantages are further acknowledged by Salmon (1972), Cross, (1974), Hale (1978), and Cunningham (1978).

The Diffusion of Power - Some Critical Variables

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) identified several variables within the situation which may impact the choice of a leadership style and the choice of whether to share decision making. Among the variables identified were the size of the organization, the problem itself (topic), whether subordinates have the knowledge to solve the problem, and whether time would allow a group process.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) have acknowledged that the opportunity provided by managers for their subordinates to participate in decision making may not only vary among leaders but also within a single leader. Vroom and Yetton developed a typology of five decision processes ranging from autocratic to consensual decision making and have found that an overwhelming proportion of managers utilized all five leadership methods depending on situational variables. Vroom and Yetton stated that it makes as much sense to talk about autocratic or participative situations as it does to talk about autocratic or participative managers. The authors identified a number of situational variables which the manager must evaluate before selecting a leadership method. Among these variables were the time in which a solution must be found, the quality of the solution needed, and the information available to the manager. Other considerations were the potential for the acceptance of the decision, the degree to which subordinates can be trusted to accept organizational goals, and the degree to which a solution will generate conflict among subordinates.

Implied in several of Vroom and Yetton's (1973) variables was the issue of topic. If a particular issue is politically potent and the risks are high, the choice to share decision making with subordinates may be critical. If a leader is concerned a group's decision may be of poor quality, the acceptance potential low, or organizational goals are not met, then clearly the issue may best be held for a more independent decision.

For March and Olsen (1976), time, topic, and the right of participation are interrelated. Participation in decision making yields a symbolic status but requires time. March and Olsen stated: "The

individuals who end up making the decision are disproportionably those who have nothing better to do"(p.47).

Time is a finite resource, therefore organizational size may impact the degree to which a single individual within the organization may be provided choice opportunities. The superintendent of a large school system may have less opportunity to attend to as many issues as would a superintendent of a smaller district.

Wynn and Guditus (1984) identified variables which should be considered by the school superintendent before sharing decision making. These variables include whether the topic to be considered is executive in nature, whether the superintendent is willing to accept the risks of group decision, and whether there is adequate time for a group decision.

Organizational size, topic, and time available in which to decide, seem to be fundamental organizational and situational variables which must be considered by leaders when deciding whether to share decision making with subordinates or others. Regionality (state), although not addressed in the literature, was of interest to this study because states have idiosyncratic rules, regulations and organizational differences which may influence the decision-making function. The variable state was therefore included.

Methodology

The following is an overview of study methodology. A rather detailed explanation of the scale metric is provided.

The Study Sample

Two hundred and forty school superintendents were randomly selected from Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. Samples were stratified into cells of equal N's by state and district size; eighty were selected from each state, forty from districts of 1,000 or more student enrollment and forty from districts of less than 1,000 student enrollment.

The sample included three states in order to check the potential regionality of administrative decision-making practices. Enrollment size stratification was used to standardize the size of administrative staffs.

Development of the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory

The Situational Administrative Decision-making Inventory (SADI) contains "real life" situations presented with explicit time constraints in six general topic categories. Respondents were asked to examine the situations and to choose the decision-making process which most closely resembled the one they would use to resolve the issue.

Topic Categories

The establishment of realistic topic categories was pivotal to the success of the study. It was believed that topic categories should be generic headings from which realistic and comprehensive situations could be developed. The development of general topic categories, under which situations were presented to respondents, was accomplished by

examining other topic category typologies used in school administration research and practice.

Peach (1978) used the following topic categories: (a) curriculum and instruction, (b) finance and business management, (c) certificated personnel, (d) pupil personnel, (e) school plant and facilities, and (f) school and community relations.

Riese (1961) developed what he termed the Situational Expectation Record which sought to measure school board member expectations of superintendents behavior under certain situations. General topic categories used by Riese were: (a) finance, (b) school program (instruction), (c) personnel relations, (d) public relations, and (e) superintendent/board relations.

Topic categories were also derived from the examination of three school district policy/procedure books from both large and small districts. The policy and procedure books were organized by sections, which included: (a) community relations, (b) students relations, (c) instruction, (d) personnel, (e) business, and (g) facilities.

A fourth source of category development was a field study carried out over several months, of two Northwestern school districts. This research investigated the administrative executive council meeting and decision-making processes (Conners, Reed & Sorenson, 1982). From the examination of data, which included field notes, group interaction processes, and meeting agenda, six general categories emerged. They were: (a) finance, (b) curriculum (instruction), (c) personnel relations,

(d) student relations, (e) community relations, and (f) district non-instructional operations.

The following general topic categories were selected for use in this study: (a) business, (b) instruction, (c) personnel relations, (d) student relations, (e) community relations, and (f) non-instructional operations. These categories represent topic areas identified by each of the four sources mentioned above, and seem to represent a realistic overview of areas with which school superintendents must contend.

The Situations

Under each of the general topic categories, three situations were composed which met the following criteria: (a) each situation described a "real life" situation, (b) each situation was applicable to large as well as small school districts, and (c) each situation carried with it a time constraint ranging from a requirement for imminent action (30 days or less) medium range action (31 to 90 days) and long range action (91 days or more). Situations were worded so that they had relevance to superintendents in Washington, Idaho, and Oregon.

The Response Alternatives

Decision-making processes were adapted from Vroom and Yetton's typology of decision making, Table 1. These five processes range from totally independent decision making without subordinate consultation to consensual decision making in which the leader agrees to accept and implement the group's decision without veto power. If respondents chose one of three processes which involved the consultation of subordinates and

TABLE 1

Vroom and Yetton's Decision-Making

Typology and Scale Values

Decision Process	Scale Value
Process #1 - Independent	
You solve the problem(s) with the information available to you at the time.	0.00
Process #2 - Limited Independent	
You obtain the necessary information from your subordinates, then you decide the solution to the problem(s). Subordinates provide information, but do not evaluate or generate alternatives.	0.63
Process #3 - Advised Independent	
You share the problem(s) with relevant subordinates or others individually, getting their ideas/suggestions, without bringing them together as a group. Your decision may or may not reflect their influence.	5.00
Process #4 - Limited Consensual	
You share the problem(s) with a group of subordinates or others, obtaining their collective ideas/suggestions. You make a decision which may or may not reflect group input.	8.13
Process #5 - Consensual	
You share the problem(s) with a group of subordinates or others. Together you generate and evaluate alternatives attempting to reach consensus. You are willing to accept and implement any solution supported by the entire group.	10.00

others, they were asked to indicate the group(s) with whom they would share the issue.

The Inventory Scale Metric

Vroom and Yetton assigned values to these five decision choices and presented what they described as an ordered difference scale. Coombs (1964) suggested the development of a unidimensional scale using rank order data. Vroom and Yetton (1973) illustrate Coombs' procedure with the following example:

> Let us consider a set of showers, each set at a different temperature. Each shower can be characterized by a point on the centigrade scale, and with a thermometer it would be a simple procedure to establish the location of the temperature of each shower on that scale.
>
> Now assume that no thermometer exists. By what procedure can we locate these temperatures on an interval scale? Let us assume that an individual's utility for a shower is proportional to the absolute difference between the temperature of the shower and the temperature of his ideal or perfect shower. Further assume that different individuals have different ideal shower temperatures. We could now ask a number of individuals to rank order the showers from most to least desirable. Differences in the temperature of the ideal shower would result in different preference orderings among the showers. Coombs (1964) outlines a procedure that tests whether an underlying scale exists. If such a scale does exist, the procedure makes a numerical assignment to each of the showers (p.66).

Coombs (1964) describes the process this way:

> Each individual and each stimulus may be represented by a point on a common dimension called a J scale, and each individual's preference ordering of the stimuli from most to least preferred corresponds to the rank order of the absolute distances of the stimulus points from the ideal point, the nearest being the most preferred. The individual's preference ordering is called an I scale and may be thought of as the J scale folded at the ideal point with only the rank order of the stimuli given in order of increasing distance from the ideal point (p.80).

Vroom and Yetton asked 597 managers to examine a description of their five decision-making processes and rank them by frequency of use. There was a potential of 120 permutations however the authors found a subset of orderings which accounted for 64.4 percent of all orderings. Vroom and Yetton stated: "Clearly these judgments were not randomly distributed across the 120 possibilities" (p.67). From this rank ordering values were developed for each process.

These values are the result of computing the frequency with which each process is used in the sample population and reflects the distribution of the variable participation in the population. After the relative distances between stimulus points have been established a numeric value can be assigned to each converting it from an ordered metric scale to an interval scale.

Coombs (1964) explains:

> We begin with a partial order on the distances between stimuli. The general idea is to set the smallest

> interval equal to some positive but unknown quantity, [delta 1] and successively larger distances are obtained by introducing additional unknown positive [deltas]. Values assigned to the [deltas] lead to interval scale values for the ordered metric scale (p.96).

An arbitrary value is assigned the first and last preference choices and value for the three points between are interpolated using the Goode Algorithm (Coombs, 1964). For the Vroom and Yetton scale, the arbitrary values were 0.00 and 10.00 respectively.

The Coombs/Goode method of converting nonmetric information into metric information is not unique. Abelson and Tukey (1959) and Shepard (1962) have also devised similar methods.

The interval scale values for the Vroom and Yetton decision-making typology, applying the above technique are as follows:

Field Testing

Initial validation of the Situational Administrative Decision-making Inventory (SADI) was done by submitting the document to three professors of education considered to be experts in questionnaire construction. Response format, efficacy of response alternatives, and the clarity of problem statements were scrutinized. Modifications were made as suggested.

A field test using three practicing superintendents from districts of differing size was done to review the reality of the situations, and their relevance to practicing administrators. Each respondent was asked to

mark the situation "Realistic" or "Not Realistic" and comment as to whether or not the situation seemed to represent the general topic category in which it was contained. Time lines for action were also examined as well as clarity of instructions. Modifications were made when necessary for clarity.

Finally, six administrators were asked to complete the inventory and comment on format, clarity of directions, and the time required to complete the task of responding. Administrators were also asked to comment on whether the situations seemed to represent the general topic category in which it was contained.

Statistical Procedures

Data were analyzed by comparing the mean scores (mean level of participation), as described by Vroom and Yetton (1973) through the application of a four-way analysis of variance. The dependent variable, participation, was quantified by using Vroom and Yetton's (1973) scale values for each decision-making process. Comparisons were made of mean scores among topic categories and time constraints, district size, and state (regionality) utilizing a computerized repeated measures technique (SAS), assigning the variables state and district size to the main plot and the variables topic and time to the sub-plot.

Comparisons of mean scores among and within each of the primary variables (state, topic, time, and district size) were made using an F test to determine the significance of differences among or between group means. If the F values were significant at the .05 level, a protected Fisher's Least Significant Difference test (FLSD) was applied for pairwise multiple

comparisons to determine between which means a significant difference existed. The Fisher's Least Significant Difference test (FLSD) was used because this procedure provides for the variance within all groups compared and minimizes the chance for Type I error while maintaining enough sensitivity to avoid Type II (Carmer & Swanson, 1971, 1973). Significant interaction effects were described in narrative.

Hopkins and Glass (1978) warned against the use of a least significant difference test when comparing the means of more than two groups, stating that the chance for Type I error increased radically as the number of group means compared increased; however, other sources in the literature disagree with this position. Carmer and Swanson (1971, 1973) reported the results of a Monte Carlo study in which the use of a protected Fisher's Least Significant Difference test (FLSD), that is one which is applied only after the F value computed among treatment means reaches a predetermined level (.05), resulted in only slightly higher Type I error frequency than the Scheffe test for significance. The protected Fisher's Least Significant Difference test produced only 2.4, 5.1 and 5.2 percent increases in Type I error for 5, 10 and 20 treatment means respectively. Since this study compares no more than 6 treatment means, a slightly more than 2% risk seemed acceptable.

Parametric statistical procedures for the treatment of these data were considered appropriate for the following reasons; (a) subjects were randomly selected, (b) this study compared the difference between mean scores. The Central Limit Theorem suggests that the sampling distribution of the mean becomes normal as N increases (Hopkins & Glass, 1978; Downie &

Heath, 1970; Ferguson, 1981). "Except for extremely bizarre distributions, samples of N=25 or more can be relied upon to yield a very normal sampling distribution of means" (Hopkins & Glass, 1978, p.196-7), (c) Vroom and Yetton (1973) first established a unidimensional ordered metric scale for their five point decision-making typology by applying an unfolding technique described by Coombs (1964) then further converted this "ordered difference scale" to an interval scale by using an algorithm described by Goode (Coombs, 1964) for the expressed purpose of using parametric statistical procedures.

Statement of Findings

This portion of the study describes the results of data analysis and provides s summary of mean score comparisons for each of the independent variables. Findings are the result of the following procedures: (a) an F test was applied, but only to mean scores that were reported significant ($p<.05$) by analysis of variance or those that were involved in significant interactions; (b) if the result of an F test among group means was reported significant at the .05 level of confidence, a protected Fisher's Least Significant Difference test (FLSD) was used to determine between which means significant differences existed. Variance among state group mean scores was not shown to be significant ($p<.05$) by analysis of variance and therefore an F test was not appropriate. However, state scores were included in 2, three-way interactions. State scores were compared to the mean scores of other variables involved in the interaction (topic and time); state and size were not compared.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Responses by State

State	Number		Percent	
	Contacted	Returns	Total Returns	Group Returns
Washington	80	60	32.6	75.5
Oregon	80	61	33.2	76.2
Idaho	80	63	34.2	78.8
Total	240	184	100.0	76.7

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Responses by District Size

District Size	Number		Percent	
	Contacted	Returns	Total Returns	Group Returns
$\geq$ 1,000	120	88	47.8	73.3
< 1,000	120	96	52.2	80.0
Total	240	184	100.0	76.7

All declarations of significance using the Fisher's Least Significant Difference test, for pairwise multiple comparisons, were at the .05 level of confidence.

Characteristics of the Sample

Two hundred and forty superintendents were sent the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory (SADI). One hundred and eighty-four (184) superintendents returned the document for a total response rate of 76.7% The response rate by state (Table 2) was 75.5%, 76.2%, and 78.8% for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, respectively.

The response rate by district size was 73.3% and 80.0% for districts of 1,000 and more, and fewer than 1,000 student enrollment respectively (Table 3).

Responding superintendents represented a variety of backgrounds with regard to years of experience as superintendent, (Table 4) but the majority of them were experienced administrators. Forty-two percent had 10 or more years of experience, 39.1% had from 3-9 years, and only 15.2% of the sample had 2 years or less experience. About 4% did not indicate their amount of experience in the demographic section of the inventory.

An obvious requirement for the establishment of a management team is the number of subordinate administrators available for consultation. An effort was made to arrange the stratification of the random sample such that respondents represented districts with both large and small administrative staffs. The response rate by size of administrative staff (Table 5) reflects that 39.1% of responding superintendents had

TABLE 4

Number and Percent of Respondents by Length of Service As Superintendent

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent of Total
10 or More Years	77	41.9
3 - 9 Years	72	39.1
2 or Less Years	28	15.2
No Response	7	3.8
Total	184	100.0

TABLE 5

Number and Percent of Respondents by Size of Administrative Staff

Administrative Staff Size	Frequency	Percent of Total
9 or More	48	26.1
6 - 8	24	13.0
3 - 5	37	20.1
0 - 2	69	37.5
No Response	6	3.3
Total	184	100.0

administrative staffs of 6 or more. Fifty-nine percent had administrative staffs of more than 3 and 37.5% had an administrative staff of fewer than 3.

Relationship Among Variables

When variance among group mean scores, for the four independent variables, state, district size, topic, and time were analyzed, 3 were reported to be significant ($p<.01$). Variance of group scores for the variable state did not prove to be significant. Results of the analysis of variance including significant interactions are included in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance - Four-Way Classification

Source of Variation	p
Size	.0002**
Time	.0001**
State	.3175
Topic	.0001**
Interactions	
Size by Topic	.0020**
State by Size by Time	.0112**
State by Topic by Time	.0261**

** Denotes significance at the .01 level

Interaction

Although the analysis of variance resulted in 3 interactions which were statistically significant, it should be stated that the error term was extremely powerful (df=3026). Furthermore, The analysis of variance F values for these interactions were considerably smaller than other significant F values and the statement of their significance should be made with some caution. Although one might expect to see some crossover among mean scores in a significant interaction, this did not occur in two of the three cases.

The state by topic by time interaction did contain some crossover of mean scores. When examining scores by individual states and topic categories, across time constraints, there were occasions when the medium time constraint items received a lower mean score, that is, a more independent treatment than did the short time constraint item. Furthermore, in some instances, medium time constraint situations received a higher mean score (more participative treatment) than did the longer time frame issues. This occasional topic by time crossover probably contributed to the significant interaction. When group mean scores for individual states were pooled within district size categories, with district size representing responses from all states, the interaction was also significant. Data in Table 7 illustrate that in some cases, the short time constraint item situation received a higher participation score than did the medium time constraint item. Examples are the topic categories of instruction and personnel relations.

TABLE 7

Situation Descriptions Within Time Categories With Mean Scores

Topic Category	Situation Description	Mean Score
	Short Time Category	
Business	Budget Revisions Now	5.86
Community Relations	News Report on Low Test Scores	3.70
Instruction	Policies/Procedures Sex Education	8.02
Non-Instructional Ops.	Open School During Class. Strike	6.52
Personnel Relations	Collective Bargaining Non-Tchrs	5.81
Student Relations	Student Newspaper Censorship	4.30
	Medium Time Category	
Business	Establish Levy Amount	7.80
Community Relations	Interim Board Member Selection	5.29
Instruction	Innovative Fed. Rdg. Prog.	7.50
Non-Instructional Ops.	Contracting Transportation	6.84
Personnel Relations	Collective Bargaining Teachers	5.12
Student Relations	Dev. Student Discipline Policy	8.18
	Long Time Category	
Business	Budget Cuts For Next Year	7.85
Community Relations	School Closure	8.42
Instruction	Student Minimum Competencies	8.59
Non-Instructional Ops.	Contracting Food Services	6.85
Personnel Relations	Classified Evaluation	6.72
Student Relations	Dev. Student Attendance Policy	8.16

another was said to represent a decision-making process which was significantly more independent. Conversely, a score which is significantly greater than another was said to represent a process more participative in nature.

Independent Variables

What follows is a summary of findings for each of the study variables.

Time to Decide

Time to decide is a significant determinant variable which impacts the choice of the decision-making process selected by superintendents on the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory (SADI). Variance among scores, for the variable time, was reported to be significant at the .01 level by analysis of variance.

Time appeared to have a powerful impact on the decision processes selected by respondents within states (Table 8), within topic categories (Table 9), as well as, within district size categories (Table 10). In most cases the less time there was to make a decision, the less participation of subordinate administrators and others was indicated. The converse was also true, when longer planning time frames were provided, respondents were more likely to choose a decision-making process that was more participative.

TABLE 8

Mean Scores Within States by Time

State	Mean Scores				Mean Difference
Washington	(S)[a]	5.26	v.	(M)[b] 6.65	1.39*[d]
	(S)	5.26	v.	(L)[c] 7.68	2.42*[e]
	(M)	6.65	v.	(L) 7.68	1.03*[f]
Idaho	(S)	5.76	v.	(M) 6.93	1.17*
	(S)	5.76	v.	(L) 7.98	2.22*
	(M)	6.93	v.	(L) 7.98	1.05*
Oregon	(S)	6.07	v.	(M) 6.78	.71
	(S)	6.07	v.	(L) 7.98	1.91*
	(M)	6.78	v.	(L) 7.98	1.20*

[a] (S) Represents short time constraints

[b] (M) Represents medium time constraints

[c] (L) Represents long time constraints

[d] Least Significant Difference between Washington time constraints = .94

[e] Least Significant Difference between Idaho time constraints = .91

[f] Least Significant Difference between Oregon time constraints = .93

* Denotes significance at the .05 level

TABLE 9

Mean Scores Within Topic Categories by Time Constraints

Topic/ Category	Time Constraint Mean Scores	Mean Difference
Business	(S)[a] 5.85 v. (M)[b] 7.80	1.95*
	(S) 5.85 v. (L)[c] 7.85	2.00*
	(M) 7.80 v. (L) 7.85	.05
Community Relations	(S) 3.70 v. (M) 5.29	1.59*
	(S) 3.70 v. (L) 8.42	4.72*
	(M) 5.29 v. (L) 8.42	3.13*
Instruction	(S) 8.02 v. (M) 7.50	.52
	(S) 8.02 v. (L) 8.59	.57*
	(M) 7.50 v. (L) 8.59	1.09*
Non-Instructional Operations	(S) 6.52 v. (M) 6.84[d]	
	(S) 6.52 v. (L) 6.85	
	(M) 6.84 v. (L) 6.85	
Personnel Relations	(S) 5.81 v. (M) 5.12	.69*
	(S) 5.81 v. (L) 6.72	.91*
	(M) 5.12 v. (L) 6.72	1.60*
Student Relations	(S) 4.30 v. (M) 8.18	3.88*
	(S) 4.30 v. (L) 8.16	3.86*
	(M) 8.18 v. (L) 8.16	.02

[a] (S) Represents short time constraints

[b] (M) Represents medium time constraints

[c] (L) Represents long time constraints

[d] F value among mean scores not significant - no FLSD test applied

Least Significant Difference for all mean scores = .53

* Denotes significance at .05 level

TABLE 10

Mean Scores Within District Size Categories by Time Constraint

District Size Categories	Time Constraint Mean Scores	Mean Difference
<1,000	(S) 5.34 v. (M) 6.34	1.00*
	(S) 5.34 v. (L) 7.35	2.01*
	(M) 6.34 v. (L) 7.35	1.01*
=>1,000	(S) 6.10 v. (M) 7.28	1.18*
	(S) 6.10 v. (L) 8.21	2.11*
	(M) 7.28 v. (L) 8.21	.93*

(S) Represents short time constraints

(M) Represents medium time constraints

(L) Represents long time constraints

Least significant difference among means for districts <1,000 = .74

Least significant difference among means for districts =>1,000 = .77

*Denotes significance at the .05 level

District Enrollment Size

Variance of scores between two categories of district enrollment size was found to be significant by analysis of variance at the .01 level of confidence. When compared to the other significant variables, district size contributed to significant differences in the decision-making process

selected by respondents. Large district respondents selected processes which were significantly more participative in nature than small districts for each of 3 time constraint categories (Table 11) and in 2 of 6 topic categories (Table 12). There was no significant relationship between districts enrollment size and state.

TABLE 11

Mean Scores Between District Size Categories by Time Constraint

Time Constraint	District Size Mean Score		Mean Difference
	≤1,000	≥1,000	
Short	5.34	6.10	.76*
Medium	6.34	7.28	.94*
Long	7.35	8.21	.86*

Least Significant Difference between means = .76

* Denotes significance at the .05 level of confidence

School district enrollment size is an indicator of organizational complexity. Larger school districts are presumably more organizationally complex than smaller districts. The size of the working unit is a variable which effects the choice of leadership style and probably represents an interrelationship between organizational complexity and the time available to decision makers. Leaders of complex organizations probably have less time to attend to a large variety of choice situations and therefore the

TABLE 12

Mean Scores Between District Size Categories by Topic

Topic/ Category	District Size Mean Scores		Mean Difference
	<1,000	≥1,000	
Business	6.65	7.74	1.09*
Community Relations	5.76	5.85	.09
Instruction	7.67	8.44	.77
Non-Instructional Operations	6.08	7.46	1.38*
Personnel Relations	5.39	6.42	1.03
Student Relations	6.51	7.29	.78

Least Significant Difference between means = 1.07

* Denotes significance at the .05 level

decision making process is more participative in nature. Leaders of complex organizations may, out of need, utilize subordinates and others in the resolution of some issues.

Issue Topic

An analysis of variance for topic category mean scores produced an F value significant at the .01 level of confidence. Additional tests of significance between topic mean scores and those of other significant variables revealed that topic category influenced the choice of decision process by respondents within states (Table 13), within time categories (Table 14) and within school district size categories (Table 15). The pairings with the strongest relationship seemed to be topic versus time and topic versus district size.

Topics described in the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory such as student censorship, collective bargaining or news interviews may have been highly political and place the superintendent in a vulnerable position. Professional survival may dictate that some issues be handled without the relative risk of group processes. Conversely, topics described in the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory, which required less immediate and direct attention from the superintendent, such as student discipline and attendance policies or topics relative to instruction, may be deferred for participation from subordinates or others.

TABLE 13

Mean Scores Within States by Topic

Topic/ Categories	Idaho Topic Mean Scores					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	7.18	6.29	7.87	6.75	5.91	6.68
	Mean Differences					
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	.89[a]	.				
Instruction (I)	.69	1.58*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.43	.46	1.12	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	1.27	.38	1.96*	.84	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.50	.39	1.19	.07	.77	.

	Washington Topic Mean Scores					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	7.01	5.13	8.18	6.55	5.50	6.84
	Mean Differences					
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	1.88*[b]	.				
Instruction (I)	1.17	3.05*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.46	1.42*	1.63*	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	1.51*	.37	2.68*	1.05	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.17	1.71*	1.34*	.29	1.34*	.

TABLE 13- Continued

Mean Scores Within States by Topic

Topic/ Category	Oregon Topic Mean Scores					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	7.37	5.97	8.08	6.92	6.22	7.12
	Mean Differences					
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	1.40*[c]	.				
Instruction (I)	.71	2.11*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.45	.95	1.16	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	1.15	.25	1.86*	.70	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.25	1.15	.96	.20	.90	.

F value for Idaho = 10.84, $p<.05$

F value for Washington = 26.60, $p<.05$

F value for Oregon = 13.11, $p<.05$

[a] Least Significant Difference among Idaho mean scores = 1.29

[b] Least Sifnificant Difference among Washington mean scores = 1.32

[c] Least Significant Difference among Oregon mean scores = 1.32

* Denotes significance at the .05 level

TABLE 14

Mean Scores Among Topic Categories by Time Constraint

Topic/ Category	Short Time Constraint Mean Scores					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	5.86	3.70	8.02	6.52	5.81	4.30
			Mean Differences			
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	2.16*[a]	.				
Instruction (I)	2.16*	4.32*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.66*	2.82*	1.50*	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	.05	2.11*	2.21*	.71*	.	
Student Relations (SR)	1.56*	.60*	3.72*	2.22*	1.51*	.

	Medium Time Constraint Mean Scores					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	7.80	5.29	7.50	6.84	5.12	8.18
			Mean Differences			
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	2.51*[b]	.				
Instruction (I)	.30	2.21*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.96*	1.55*	.66*	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	2.68*	.17	2.38*	1.72*	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.38	2.89*	.68*	1.34*	3.06*	.

TABLE 14 - Continued

Mean Scores Among Topic Categories by Time Constraints

Topic/ Category	Long Time Constraint Mean Scores					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	7.85	8.42	8.59	6.85	6.72	8.16
	Mean Differences					
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	.57*[c]	.				
Instruction (I)	.74*	.17	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	1.00*	1.57*	1.74*	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	1.13*	1.70*	1.87*	.13	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.31	.26	.43	1.31*	1.44*	.

F value for short time constraint items = 330.22

F value for medium time constraint items = 232.89

F value for long time constraint itmes = 87.76

[a] Least Significant Difference among short time constraint items = .53

[b] Least Significant Difference among medium time constraint items = .53

[c] Least Significant Difference among long time constraint items = .53

* Denotes significance at the .05 level

TABLE 15

Mean Scores Within District Size Categories by Topic

Topic/ Category	Mean Scores Districts < 1,000					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	6.65	5.76	7.67	6.08	5.39	6.51
	Mean Differences					
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	.89 [a]	.				
Instruction (I)	1.02	1.91*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.57	.32	1.59*	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	1.26*	.37	2.28*	.69	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.14	.75	1.16*	.43	1.12*	.

	Mean Scores Districts ≥ 1,000					
	(B)	(CR)	(I)	(NIO)	(PR)	(SR)
	7.74	5.85	8.44	7.46	6.42	7.29
Business (B)	.					
Community Relations (CR)	1.89* [b]	.				
Instruction (I)	.70	2.59*	.			
Non-Instructional Operations (NIO)	.28	1.61*	.98	.		
Personnel Relations (PR)	1.32*	.57	2.02*	1.04	.	
Student Relations (SR)	.45	1.44*	1.15*	.17	.87	.

[a] Least Significant Difference between means for districts < 1,000 = 1.05

[b] Least Significant Difference between means for districts => 1,000 = 1.09

* Denotes significance at the .05 level

State

Respondent scores, by state, did not yield a significant result in analysis of variance but were involved in significant interactions with topic and time described above. The situations presented on the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory were handled fairly uniformly by respondents from Washington, Idaho and Oregon.

Translation of Mean Scores to Decision-Making Processes

Mean scores represent a location on the Vroom and Yetton scale which can be considered the ideal to a particular group of respondents for any of this study's independent variables. This notion of placement on a continuum is also in keeping with the assumptions made by Coombs (1964) in the development of scale values for the Vroom and Yetton decision-making continuum, through the unfolding technique.

Process Attributes

The range of mean scores for all situations was from 3.70 to 8.59. All mean scores therefore are located between Limited Independent (Process #2 - Scale Value 0.63) and Consensual (Process #5 Scale Value 10.0). It was assumed that a group mean score of less than 5.00 indicated that the ideal process for that group did not reach the minimum standards contained in Process #3 and therefore did not include the minimum requirement of allowing subordinates and others to generate and evaluate alternatives prior to a decision. Group mean scores which are 5.00 or higher (Process #3) at least represent a decision-making process which involves individual consultation with subordinates and others by the superintendent in which they are allowed to generate and evaluate alternatives and so on.

Individual Versus Group Consultation

Mean scores indicate that superintendents tend to handle decision-making outside formal meetings, that is, using decision-making processes which do not include the minimum activities outlined in Process #4 on the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory (Table 16). Only 4 situations provided mean scores which indicate a meeting would be called. This finding tends to corroborate other studies of decision making in school districts (Conners, Reed & Sorenson, 1982; Boles, 1975).

The use of Process #3, gathering ideas and suggestions from subordinates without bringing them together in a meeting is probably the most viable means of participation by subordinates and others without taking the relative risk of group decision-making processes. It could be argued that a superintendent, who called for a group meeting and elicited input from group members and then regularly overruled group consensus, would lose credibility. A more prudent approach might be for the superintendent to informally gather ideas and suggestions from subordinates and others and make a decision outside the formal meeting. This control of the decision-making process might involve the use of management practices, namely persuasion, timing and diversion, and represent the maintenance of control thought critical for professional survival.

Superintendents most often use formal meetings to resolve issues in which they include teachers, parents and students. These categories of subordinates/others are those who are probably least available to superintendents during the workday and the use of Process #3, individual consultation, would be least practical. The decision of whether to call a

TABLE 16

Decision-Making Processes Selected For Each Situation
On the Situational Administrative Decision-Making Inventory

Topic Category/ Situation	Time Category	Mean Score	Decision Process/ Scale Values		
			(#2)	(#3)	(#4)
			<5.00	5.00 - 8.12	8.13+
Business					
Budget Revisions Now	Short	5.85		*	
Estab. Levy Amount	Medium	7.80		*	
Budget Cuts - Next Year	Long	7.85		*	
Community Relations					
News Report-Low Test Scores	Short	3.70	*		
Interim Bd. Mbr. Selection	Medium	5.29		*	
School Closure	Long	8.42			*
Instruction					
Policies/Procedures Sex Ed.	Short	8.02		*	
Innovative Fed. Rdg. Prog	Medium	7.50		*	
Student Minimum Comp.	Long	8.59			*
Non-Instructional Ops.					
Open Sch.-Class. Strike	Short	6.52		*	
Contract Transportation	Medium	6.84		*	
Contract Food Services	Long	6.85		*	
Personnel Relations					
Collective Barg.-Non Tchrs	Short	5.81		*	
Collective Barg. Teachers	Medium	5.12		*	
Classified Eval. Proc.	Long	6.72		*	
Student Relations					
Student Newspaper Censor.	Short	4.30	*		
Develop Stud. Disc. Policy	Medium	8.18			*
Develop Stud. Attend. Pol.	Long	8.16			*

meeting may be influenced by the accessibility of consultants as well as the topic at hand.

Summary

Public school superintendents must routinely assess situational and organizational variable to determine when the involvement of others in decision making is indicated. The political complexion of the topic at hand, the time frame in which a decision must be made and the other organizational demands made on superintendents must be considered. The call for involvement of subordinate administrators and others in decision making fosters obvious political advantages. Successful school superintendents are probably adept at discriminating among those situations in which outside participation is essential in maintaining organizational stability and personal credibility and those which a more autocratic process is either tolerated or expected by subordinates.

Respondents to the Situational Administrative Decision-making Inventory indicated that on most occasions, subordinate administrators, or others, are consulted before a decision is made however, decisions are not regularly made in meetings such regular so called team management meetings advocated by professional administrator organizations and some normative literature. These meetings although pervasive, on most occasions, probably serve other important functions such as the dissemination of information and socialization.

The process used most frequently to resolve issues is one in which superintendents share the problem with others individually, getting their ideas and suggestions without bringing them together as a group and makes a

decision which may not reflect the influence of others. This method provides for participation without the perils of loss of control to the group and probably essential for the preservation of superintendent control.

References

Books

Abbott, M.G. (1969). Hierarchical impediments to innovation in educational organizations. In F.D. Carver and Sergiovanni, T.J. (Eds.) Organizations and human behavior: Focus on schools. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1964). The managerial grid Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coombs, C.H. (1964). A theory of data New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Downie, N.M. & Heath, R.W. (1970). Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper & Row.

Ferguson, G.A. (1981). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hanson, E.M. (1979). Educational administration and organizational behavior. Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Hopkins, K.D. & Glass, G.V. (1978). Basic statistical for the behavior sciences. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1976). Ambiguity and choice in organizations, Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.

McDonnell, L. & Pascal, A. (1979). Organized teachers in american schools. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.

Spady, R.J., Bell, C.H. & D'Angelo, G.A. (1979). A new view of authority and the administrative process. Bellevue, Washington: Forum Foundation.

Vroom, V. & Yetton, P.W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wynn, R. & Guditus, C.W. (1984). Team management: Leadership by consensus. Columbus, Ohio: C.E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Periodicals

Boles, H.W. (1975). An administrative team? The Journal of Educational Administration. 13 (2), 73-80.

Broido, L. (1980). Rules governing the private lives of teachers. Education Digest. 45, 28-31.

Carmer, S.G. & Swanson, M.R. (1971). Detection of differences between means: A Monte Carlo study of five pairwise multiple comparison procedures. Agronomy Journal, 63, 910-915.

Carmer, S.G. & Swanson, M.R. (1973). An evaluation of ten pairwise multiple comparison procedures by Monte Carlo methods. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 68, (341), 66-74.

Cross, R. (1974). "The administrative team or decentralization." The National Elementary School Principal, 54, (2) 80-82.

Its late, but there's still time to give your principals a real say in management. (1976, February). The American School Board Journal, 32-34.

Riese, H. (1961). Role expectations of the superintendent as viewed by school board members. The Research Record. March/April, 8, (3), 1-26.

Salmon, P. (1972). Are the administrative team and collective bargaining compatible? Compact. 6, (3), 3-5.

Shepard, R. (1962). The analysis of proximities: multidimensional scaling with an unknown distance function I. Psychometrika, 27, 125-40.

Tannenbaum, R. & Schmidt, W.H. (1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. Harvard Business Review. 51, 162-168.

Dissertations

Peach, L.E. (1978). Perceptions of participation in decision making and satisfaction with decisions made in the Knox County School System. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee,). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 4635A-4636A, University Microfilms No. 7903461)

Potter, M. (1981). An analysis of the extent of the participation and the effectiveness of school administrators and board members in school district management team administrative goal setting, decision-making and problem solving. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, 43, 1A-567A. (University Microfilms No. DA8215164)

Miscellaneous

Abelson, R.P. & Tukey, J.W. (1959, December). Efficient conversion of non-metric information into metric information. A paper presented at the American Statistical Association, Social Science Section, Chicago, December.

Conners, D.A., Reed, D.B. & Sorenson, L.D. (1982). Team management in public school districts: Structure, process and function. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Cullens, V. In K.A. Erickson & Rose, R.L. (1973, December). Management teams in educational administration. Ideal? Practical? Both? Oregon School Study Council, 17.

Cunningham, P.H. (1978, April). Decentralizing budget: Making the management team work. Paper presented at the National School Boards Association Annual Meeting, Anahiem, California, ED 154 499.

Erickson, K.A. & Rose, R.L. (1973, December). Management teams in educational administration. Ideal? Practical? Both? Oregon School Study Council, 17.

Hale, N. (1978). The management team. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, #43, ED 161 112

Schmuck, R.A. (1974). Development of management teamwork: A national view. A keynote address at the Fifth Annual Academy of Educational Managers. Weme,Oregon, ED 094 456.

The administrative leadership team. (1979) A joint publication of the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. Arlington, Virginia.

SITUATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION-MAKING INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: The following inventory contains eighteen situations which may be encountered by school superintendents. Each situation is accompanied by five decision-making processes. There are subtle differences among the processes; to assist your selection, key words and phrases have been underlined. You are asked to select the process which most closely resembles the procedure you would use to resolve each situation. PLEASE SELECT ONLY ONE PROCESS. If two choices seem attractive, select the one which you feel most nearly reflects your leadership style. If you choose alternatives 3,4,or 5, please check the appropriate box to indicate which group(s) you may consult. If the checklist of groups does not include the category you desire, please briefly describe under "other".

EXAMPLE

DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

Process #1: You solve the problem(s) using the information available to you at the time.

Process #2: You obtain the necessary information from your subordinates, then you decide the solution to the problem(s). Subordinates provide information but do not evaluate or generate alternatives.

Process #3: You share the problem(s) with relevant subordinates or others individually, getting their ideas/suggestions, without bringing them together as a group. Your decision may or may not reflect their influence.

Process #4: You share the problem(s) with a group of subordinates or others, obtaining their collective ideas and suggestions. You make a decision which may or may not reflect group input.

Process #5: You share the problem(s) with a group of subordinates or others. Together you generate and evaluate alternatives attempting to reach consensus. You are willing to accept and implement any solution supported by the entire group.

PROCESS NUMBER

[4]

SAMPLE SITUATION: You are the superintendent of a school district which has a declining enrollment, resulting in significant cuts in state revenues. It is necessary to reduce the teaching staff and reduction-in-force procedures, contained in the teacher negotiated agreement, will be the basis for non-renewal of teacher contracts. You wish to draft and submit a list of teachers to be released to the school board in 90 days.

From the alternatives provided above, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

* IF PROCESS FOUR WAS FELT TO BE THE MOST APPROPRIATE, THE SITUATION WOULD BE MARKED AS SHOWN ABOVE
* IF THE GROUP(S) TO BE INCLUDED WERE ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS, THE GROUP DESCRIPTION WOULD BE MARKED AS SHOWN AT RIGHT.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

.1 [✓] Administrators
.2 [✓] Teachers
.3 [ ] Students
.4 [ ] Parents
5 [ ] Other_____

DEFINITIONS: For the purposes of this inventory, subordinates is intended to mean subordinate administrators (central office or building level) under your supervision. The phrase relevant subordinates or others is intended to mean those individuals who may be of help to you in forming a decision and might include any or all of those categories provided in the group checklist located to the right of the situation.

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #1

Your district relies heavily on state funding for the majority of its revenues. Today is the first of February and you have received a letter from the state office of public instruction announcing that a substantial cut will be made in your district's state support for the next year. The district has no reserve funds and spending priorities for next year must be established and planning done over the next six months.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #2

You have been selected as superintendent and replace a superintendent who was fired by the board. You have assumed your new position in late August and the school district budget for the coming year was drafted by your predecessor. You feel that the budget requires revision before being filed with the state office of public instruction; you have two weeks to complete the task. School district administrators are available if desired.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #3

You are the school superintendent in a community which historically has not been supportive of provisions for additional school revenues gained from voter approval of local property tax levies. State appropriations are not adequate to maintain current programs and it is necessary to ask the community to approve a supplemental levy. Within 60 days, a decision must be made as to the amount of the levy and presented to the school board for their approval. Assume that no state statutory tax limit influences your decision.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #4

Your school district has no established policies and procedures which would insure minimum academic competencies prior to student promotion to the next grade or high school graduation. You and the board would like to develop competency guidelines to be phased in beginning next year.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #5

A substantial federal grant has been made available to school districts in your state, if you are willing to participate in and implement an innovative reading program. A decision must be made whether or not to compete with other school districts for the grant. This reading program utilizes a reading instructional methodology which is considered by experts to be promising. Your district is not required to provide matching funds and all materials and equipment will become the property of the school district. You have 60 days in which to respond.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #6

Over the past few years, the teaching of sex education in your district has been both a source of controversy and confrontation between the school district and its patrons. At the last two board meetings, parents were extremely critical of teaching methods and materials. You have determined that policies and procedures, relative to sex education must be reviewed and possibly modified. You would like to take a recommendation to the school board at the next regular meeting.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

SITUATION #7

Although collective bargaining with the district's teachers is still in progress, the local education association has voted to begin school this year without a settlement and continue negotiations. Salaries are not at issue but the teachers are making demands for smaller class sizes, shorter teacher workday and extra pay for meetings which might go beyond the regular workday. The most recent proposal from the teacher's association was unacceptable to you and you would like to draft a counter-proposal.

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

SITUATION #8

Non-teaching personnel in your district have not been routinely evaluated and you have determined that policies and procedures should be developed. It is mid-year and you would like to have evaluation procedures in place next year.

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

SITUATION #9

Although collective bargaining with non-teaching personnel (cooks, bus drivers and custodians) is still in progress, these employees have agreed to start the school year without settlement, but have voted to strike if settlement is not reached within three weeks. Their most recent proposal for settlement was unacceptable to you and you want to draft a counterproposal.

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process is the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #10

A student editorial, written for your district's high school newspaper, blatantly condones the use of marijuana. The paper is routinely distributed to other district schools and is set to go to press in two days. A decision must be made whether or not to censor this editorial.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #11

You have determined that a district-wide discipline policy is needed. Complaints have been voiced from the community that discipline is lax, inconsistently applied and ineffective. You would like to draft and submit a policy to the school board in 60 days.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #12

In recent years, truancy has been a significant problem at all grade levels in your school district. You have determined that a comprehensive attendance policy needs to be established during this school year, for implementation next year.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #13

Recent reductions in student enrollment have seriously impacted your district's state provided revenues. You and the school board have determined that closing one or more of the district's schools and relocating students is a viable option. A decision must be made as to which school(s) should be considered for closure within the next 6 months.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #14

One of your board members has resigned mid-term. The board has asked for the names of three eligible community members from which one person would be selected to serve as board member, by appointment, until the next regular board election. They would like the list of names in six weeks.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #15

Standardized achievement tests are given to all fourth and eighth grade students in your state. Recently, a report from the state office of education reported the results for all school districts, and your district was shown to be significantly below the state average in reading and math. Your secretary has given you a message from a local news reporter who wants to write an article about your district's test performance. You want to draft a statement for release.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #16

State revenues for your district's transportation department have been reduced and it is necessary to make cuts in bus service. Currently you are transporting children who live within the distance set as the state minimum for reimbursement of costs. You have determined that decisions must be made which will cut costs and you would like to take a recommendation to the school board in 60 days.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #17

School is set to open in one week. The union which represents your non-teaching personnel has notified you that they are on strike. A decision needs to be made as to whether or not school will open with substitute support personnel.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

PROCESS NUMBER ☐

SITUATION #18

You and the board have determined that an investigation should be made into contracting food services with an outside vendor and eliminating the on-site school lunch program. You would like to take a recommendation to the school board in four months.

From the alternatives provided at the top of this page, place the number of the decision-making process in the box at left, which most closely resembles the process you would use to resolve the issue.

If you selected alternatives 3,4, or 5, please check the group(s) with whom you would share the problem.

1 ☐ Administrators
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Students
4 ☐ Parents
5 ☐ Other_____

DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION

District Enrollment (Actual Students)

- ☐ 5,000 or More
- ☐ 1,000 - 4,999
- ☐ Fewer Than 1,000

Years Experience as Superintendent (include only superintendent exp.)

- ☐ 10 Years or More
- ☐ 3 to 9 Years
- ☐ 2 Years or Less

Number of Administrators Other Than Superintendent in District

- ☐ 9 or More
- ☐ 6 - 8
- ☐ 3 - 5
- ☐ 0 - 2

☐ Please send me a summary of the results of this study.

COMMENTS: (Please use this section to express any additional comments you might have regarding educational decision making on this inventory.)

YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS EFFORT IS VERY GREATLY APPRECIATED.